## **REMARKS**

## I. Status Summary

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6-8, 10 and 22 are all the claims pending in the application. By way of this Amendment, Applicant amends claims 1, 8 and 10. Support for the changes are found in FIG. 2A, and the specification at page 23, line 24 to page 34, line 2.

There was a clerical error in the IDS submission of May 10, 2010. Applicant submitted the proper documents to the USPTO, which are shown in PAIR as being downloaded on May 10, 2010, but the PTO/SB/08 had a typographical error. Applicant submits herewith a corrected PTO/SB/08 Form to correct this error. Since the reference was submitted in a timely fashion, and was mentioned in the IDS statement, and Applicant's error was of a clerical nature, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to consider the reference listed in the Corrected PTO/SB/08 being filed herewith.

## **II. Claim Objections**

Claims 8 and 10 are objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(c) as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim.

Applicant amends the claims to remove any ambiguities.

## III. Claim Rejections - § 112

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6-8, 10 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

Applicant amends claim 1 to state that the urethane polymer and the acrylic polymer bond together to produce a copolymer possessing a covalent bonding.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116

Appln. No.: 10/625,527

It is clear according to the following reaction formula that reacting isocyanate and

Attorney Docket No.: Q76642

carboxyl group or hydroxyl group provides a covalent bonding. This is clearly understood by

one of ordinary skill in the art.

-NCO + HO- →-NH-CO-O-

-NCO + HOOC- →-NH-CO-

In view of the foregoing and the amendments to claim 1, Applicant respectfully requests

the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

IV. Claim Rejections - Cited Art

Claims 1, 2, 6-8, 10 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by

Ochi et al. (US 5,225,267).

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Ochi et al. (US 5,225,267).

A. Claim 1

As noted above, Applicant amends claim 1 to overcome the rejection under §112.

In Ochi, a metal layer 3 is placed between a polyurethane resin layer 2a and a pressure-

sensitive adhesive layer 5 (see Fig. 1). In contrast, the claimed invention has the composite film

formed on, and in contact with, the pressure-sensitive adhesive layer. Namely, the pressure-

sensitive adhesive layer touches the composite film of the claimed invention, however, in Ochi

the adhesive layer does not touch the polyurethane resin layer.

Further, Ochi discloses a laminated resin film comprising (a) a polyvinyl chloride resin

film, (b) a polyurethane resin layer and (c) a metal layer. While the (a) film of Ochi corresponds

6

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 Attorney Docket No.: Q76642

Appln. No.: 10/625,527

to the first film of the claimed invention, the film material is different than the first film of the

claimed invention. Namely, the first film of the claimed invention is made of at least one resin

selected from the group consisting of polyethylene terephthalate, polyethylene, polypropylene,

polyimides, polyether ether ketones, polyamide resins, and polycarbonate resins. Ochi fails to

teach or suggest this type of material for the first film.

In view of the foregoing, Ochi fails to teach or suggest the claimed invention according to

claim 1. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentable.

B. Dependent Claims

The remaining rejections are directed to the dependent claims. These claims are

patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1, by virtue of their dependency therefrom...

V. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed

to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is

kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

7

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 Attorney Docket No.: Q76642

Appln. No.: 10/625,527

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC Telephone: (202) 293-7060

Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE 23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: March 23, 2011

/Ellen R. Smith/

Ellen R. Smith

Registration No. 43,042